

Management
Course Number: 26:620:556
Course Title: Theory & Research
Organizational Structure

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This Ph.D. seminar is intended to introduce students to the foundational questions and perspectives in research on organizational theory. We will examine organizational research from multiple disciplinary viewpoints (e.g., sociology, economics, political science, etc.), and cover canonical pieces to more contemporary research. Students will be exposed to a set of methodologically diverse approaches, which they will be asked to interrogate and compare. The course will be organized as a doctoral seminar. Our primary activities will include critical discussion of assigned articles and how these relate to our own nascent and ongoing research activities.

COURSE MATERIALS

1. Scott, W.R. & Davis, G.F. 2006. *Organizations & Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*, 1st Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
2. Articles and book selections that I will provide you, or that are readily available to you online. Please check Canvas (canvas.rutgers.edu) and your official Rutgers email account regularly.

PLEASE NOTE: I will adjust the required readings and topics from time to time during the term. Other than the one required book, which we will use for sure, please consider the rest of the reading assignments as “draft.”

LEARNING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This seminar is targeted to participants who are pursuing research-based academic careers. The primary objective is to survey some of the major theoretical perspectives and issues studied in organization theory research, including both classic and contemporary scholarship and both theoretical and empirical contributions.

One goal is to provide you with the opportunity to gain a solid background in the field, such that it will inform and enrich their own research, whether or not you become an organization theorist.

A second goal is to support you in drafting a paper that incorporates one or more of the topics covered in class with your own research interests and to help you learn in a hands-on manner about review and revision processes.

PREREQUISITES

Doctoral student in Rutgers Business School or permission of instructor (for graduate students from other disciplines).

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

I do NOT tolerate cheating. Students are responsible for understanding the RU Academic Integrity Policy (<http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/>)

I will strongly enforce this Policy and pursue *all* violations. On all examinations and assignments, students must sign the RU Honor Pledge, which states, “On my honor, I have neither received nor given any unauthorized assistance on this examination or assignment.” I will screen all written assignments through *SafeAssign* or *Turnitin*, plagiarism detection services that compare the work against a large database of past work. Don’t let cheating destroy your hard-earned opportunity to learn. See business.rutgers.edu/ai for more details.

GRADING

Grading will be based primarily on student performance in class participation (40%), final paper (40%), and peer review (20%).

- **Class Participation (40% of grade):** Each participant is required to come prepared to class. Since class discussion is an integral part of the course, absences and lack of preparedness are unacceptable. Preparation will always involve reading and working with all the weekly assignments.

In addition to being prepared to engage in discussion every class, you will also be asked to prepare as discussion initiators for two sessions of the seminar. I will lead the discussions in the first two seminar sessions while everyone else is getting settled; the session assignments will be made during the first class (September 5).

- **Final Paper (40% of grade):** Participants will write a research proposal or a research paper that relates one or more of the topics covered in class to their own research interests. I am flexible as to the format of the paper, because I want it to meet your needs. But it has to be about Organization Theory in some non-trivial way. One option is the "front end" of a research paper that defines a research question, reviews and critiques the extant literature, develops a few testable hypotheses, and proposes a method for testing the proposed hypotheses. If you have data and want to do a full paper with analysis and results that's okay, but you are still subject to the page limit. A pure theory paper is also acceptable, as is the development of a dissertation proposal. The body of the manuscript (excluding title page, references, figures, etc.) should not exceed 25 PAGES, double spaced with one inch margins and 12 point times new roman font. Around the halfway point of the class, I will ask you to submit a one to two page sketch of the basic idea.
- **Integration Memo (20% of grade):** Between week 10 and 13, you will submit a four-page maximum memo/essay that compares and contrasts the approach of three schools of organizational theory on a particular subject. The essay should highlight the basic assumptions, strengths, weaknesses, disagreements, etc. of each approach, and provide an evaluation on which

school of thought is most appealing, and why.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Session	Topic
1	Introduction and overview
2	Bureaucracy and other classical theories
3	Carnegie School and organizational learning
4	Contingency theory and organizational design
5	Resource dependence and power
6	Institutional theory I
7	Organizational ecology
8	Organizational economics
9	Networks and social capital
10	Institutional theory II
11	Culture
12	Status and reputation
	Thanksgiving Break
13	Social movements
14	Professions and work

READING LIST

For students who have a particular interest in any topic, I am happy to provide further reading recommendations.

Session 1 Introduction and Overview of Organization Theory

1. Scott. & Davis Chapter 1
2. Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. Academy of Management Review, 18: 599-620.
3. Barley, S. 2016. 60th Anniversary Essay: Ruminations on how we became a mystery house and how we might get out. Administrative Science Quarterly, 61(1) 1-8.
4. Lounsbury, M., & Beckman, C. M. 2015. Celebrating organization theory. Journal of Management Studies, 52(2): 288-308.

Further Reading

- Suddaby, R., Hardy, C. & Huy, Q.N. 2011. Where are the new theories of organization? Academy of Management Review, 36(2): 236-246.
- Davis, G. F., & Marquis, C. 2005. Prospects for organization theory in the early twenty-first century: Institutional fields and mechanisms. Organization Science, 16(4), 332-343.
- Pfeffer, J. 1997. New directions for organization theory: Problems and prospects. Oxford University Press. Chapters 1 and 9.
- Hambrick, D. C. 2007. The field of management's devotion to theory: Too much of a good thing?. Academy of Management Journal, 50(6), 1346-1352.

Session 2 Bureaucracy and Other Classical Theories

1. Scott & Davis Chapter 2, 3
2. Weber, M.1978. Economy and Society, pp.212-223 (legal authority); 226-231 (traditional authority); 241-249 (charismatic authority); 956-963 (bureaucracy) (Other than section on bureaucracy, read quickly).
3. Taylor, F.W. 1916. Principles of Scientific Management, 30-49; 58-97; 118-144 (Note: Read quickly; do not get mired down in details; the idea is to familiarize yourself with Taylor's main approach and arguments)
4. Roethlisberger, F.J. & Dickson, W.J. 1939. Management and the Worker. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Selections from Chapters 1, 17, 21-25
5. Barnard, C.I. 1938. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. pp. 82-123, 139-184.

Further Reading

- Edwards, R. 1979. Contested Terrain. Chapters 1-6
- Perrow,, C. 1986. Complex Organizations: A critical essay. New York: Random House. Chapter 3.
- Blau, P. 1972. Interdependence and Hierarchy in Organizations. Social Science Research 1: 1-24

Session 3 Carnegie School and Organizational Learning

1. March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. 1958. Organizations, Chapter 6
2. Cyert, R.M., & March, J.G. 1963. Chapter 7: A summary of basic concepts. From: A behavioral theory of the firm.
3. Greve, H. 1998. Performance, Aspirations, and Risky Organizational Change. Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 43 (1): 58-86.
4. March, J. G. 1991. Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning. Organization Science, 2(1): 71-87.
5. Cohen, S. L., Bingham, C. B., & Hallen, B. L. (2019). The role of accelerator designs in mitigating bounded rationality in new ventures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 64(4), 810-854.

Further Reading

- Levitt, B. & March, J. G. 1988. Organizational Learning. Annual Review of Sociology, 14:319-340.
- Levinthal, D. A. 1997. Adaptation on rugged landscapes. Management science, 43(7), 934-950
- Gavetti, G. 2005. Cognition and Hierarchy: Rethinking the Microfoundations of Capabilities' Development. Organization Science 16 (6):599–617.
- Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. 1972. A garbage can model of organizational choice". Administrative Science Quarterly, 17: 1-25.

Session 4 Contingency Theory and Organizational Design

1. Thompson, J.D. 1967. Organizations in Action. 1-65.
2. Lawrence, P and Lorsch, J. 1969. Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration. Intro, Ch. 1 and Ch. 6.
3. Schoonhoven, C.B. 1981. Problems with contingency theory: Testing assumptions hidden within the language of contingency theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 349-377.
4. Tushman, M. L., & Nadler, D. A. 1978. Information processing as an integrating concept in organizational design. Academy of Management Review, 3(3), 613-624.
5. Keum, D. D., & See, K. E. (2017). The influence of hierarchy on idea generation and selection in the innovation process. Organization Science, 28(4), 653-669.

Further Reading

- Burns, T. & G.M. Stalker. 1961. The Management of Innovation. Tavistock Publications. Chapter 1
- Chandler, A.D. 1962. Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise. Chapter 1.
- Donaldson, L. 1987. Strategy and Structural Adjustment to Regain Fit: In Defense of Contingency Theory. Journal of Management Studies, (24:1-24)
- Sine, W.D., Mitsuhashi, H. & Kirsch, D.A. 2006. Revisiting Burns and Stalker: Formal structure and new venture performance in emerging economic sectors. Academy of Management Journal, 49: 121-132.

Session 5 Resource Dependence Theory and Power

1. Emerson, R.M. 1962. "Power-dependence relations." American Sociological Review, 27: 31-41.

2. Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. 1978. The external control of organizations. New York: Harper & Row. Chapters 1 & 3
3. Casciaro, T. & Piskorski, M.J. 2005. "Power imbalance, mutual dependence and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory." Administrative Science Quarterly, 50: 167-199.
4. Wry, T., Cobb, J.A. & Aldrich, H.E. 2013. More than a metaphor: Assessing the historical legacy of resource dependence and its contemporary promise as a theory of environmental complexity. The Academy of Management Annals, 7: 439-486.
5. Garg, S., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2017). Unpacking the CEO–board relationship: How strategy making happens in entrepreneurial firms. Academy of Management Journal, 60(5), 1828-1858.

Further Reading

- M. Gargiulo. 1993. Two-step leverage: Managing constraint in organizational politics. Administrative Science Quarterly. 38 (1): 1-19.
- Chandler, A.D. 1977. The Visible Hand. Ch. 14 and Conclusion.
- Davis, G. and H. Greve. 1997. "Corporate Elite Networks and Governance Changes in the 1980s." American Journal of Sociology 103 (1): 1-37.

Session 6 Institutional theory I

1. Selznick, P. 1957. Leadership in Administration. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. - Chapters 1 and 5
2. Stinchcombe, A. 1965. "Social Structure and Organizations" in James G. March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally. 142-193.
3. Meyer and Rowan, 1977. "Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony" AJS 83: 340-63
4. DiMaggio, P.J. and W.W. Powell. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147-160.
5. Fligstein, N. 1985. "The spread of the multidivisional form among large firms, 1919-1979" American Sociological Review 50 (3): 377-391.

Further Reading

- Scott, R. 2001. Institutions and Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Chapters 3-5.
- Zucker, Lynne G. 1977. "The Role of Institutionalization in Cultural Persistence." American Sociological Review 42: 726-743
- Selznick, P. 1996. Institutionalism "old" and "new". Administrative Science Quarterly, 270-277.
- DiMaggio, P.J. and W.W. Powell. 1991. The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis. Chicago University Press.

Session 7 Organizational Ecology

1. Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. 1977. The population ecology of organizations. American Journal of Sociology, 82: 929-964.
2. Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. 1984. Structural inertia and organizational change. American Sociological Review, 49: 149-164.

3. Carroll, G. and Swaminathan, A. 2000. "Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the US Brewing Industry." American Journal of Sociology, 106:715-762.
4. Young, R. 1988. "Is population ecology a useful paradigm for the study of organizations?" American Journal of Sociology 94: 1-24; Freeman, J., & Hannan, M.T. 1989. Setting the record straight on organizational ecology: Rebuttal to Young. American Journal of Sociology, 95: 425-439
5. Hsu, G., Hannan, M. T., & Koçak, Ö. 2009. Multiple category memberships in markets: An integrative theory and two empirical tests. *American Sociological Review*, 74(1), 150-169.

Further Reading

- Baum, J.A.C. & J. V. Singh.1994. Organizational niches and the dynamics of organizational mortality. American Journal of Sociology 100(2): 346-380.
- Podolny, J., T. E. Stuart, & M.T. Hannan. 1996. Networks, Knowledge, and Niches: Competition in the worldwide semiconductor industry, 1984-1991. American Journal of Sociology 102 (3) 659-689.
- Sørensen, J. B., and T.E. Stuart. 2000. Aging, Obsolescence, and Organizational Innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly 45 (1): 81-112.
- Dobrev, SD, TY Kim, and MT Hannan. 2000. Dynamics of Niche Width and Resource Partitioning. American Journal of Sociology, 106(5): 1299-1337

Session 8 Organizational Economics

1. Coase, R.H. 1937. The nature of the firm. Economica. 4(16): 386-405.
2. Williamson, O. 1981. The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach. American Journal of Sociology, 87: 548-577
3. David, R.J. & Han, S.K. 2004. A systematic assessment of the empirical support for transaction cost economics. Strategic Management Journal, 25: 39-58.
4. Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of management review*, 14(1), 57-74.
5. Neckebrouck, J., Schulze, W., & Zellweger, T. (2018). Are family firms good employers?. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(2), 553-585.

Further Reading

- Cuypers, I., Hennart, J. F., Silverman, B., & Ertug, G. (2020). Transaction Cost Theory: Past Progress, Current Challenges, and Suggestions for the Future. *Academy of Management Annals*, (ja).
- Pisano, G.P. 1990. The R&D boundaries of the firm: An empirical analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35: 153-176.
- Hart, Oliver. 1995. Firms, Contracts, and Financial Structure (especially chapters 1-3). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmström, Bengt, and John Roberts. 1998. The boundaries of the firm revisited. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 12: 73-94.
- Kapoor, R. & R. Adner. 2012. What firms make vs. what they know: how firms' production and knowledge boundaries affect competitive advantage in the face of technological change. Organization Science 23 (5): 1227-1248

Session 9 Networks and Social Capital

1. Granovetter, M.S. 1985. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. American Journal of Sociology 91: 481-510.
2. Burt, R.S. 1992. The Social Structure of Competition. Chapter 2.
3. Uzzi, B. 1997. Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness, Administrative Science Quarterly: 35-67.
4. Powell, W.W. 1990. Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. Research in Organizational Behavior, 12, 295-336.
5. Hansen, M. T. (1999). The search-transfer problem: The role of weak ties in sharing knowledge across organization subunits. Administrative science quarterly, 44(1), 82-111.

Further Reading

- Granovetter, M.S. 1978. The strength of weak ties. American Journal of Sociology, 78 (6): 1360-1380.
- Podolny, J. 2001. Networks as the Pipes and Prisms of the Market. American Journal of Sociology 107 (1): 33-60.
- Adler, P.S., & Kwon, S. 2002. Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. Academy of Management Review, 27: 17-40.
- Padgett, J.F. and P. MacLean. 2006. Organizational Invention and Elite Transformation: The Birth of Partnership Systems in Renaissance Florence. American Journal of Sociology, 111(5), 1463-1568.
- Fleming, L., S. Mingo, & D. Chen. 2007. Collaborative Brokerage, Generative Creativity, and Creative Success. Administrative Science Quarterly, 52(3), 443-475.
- .

Session 10 Institutional Theory II

1. Zuckerman, E. 1999. The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the legitimacy discount. American Journal of Sociology, 104(5), 1398-1438.
2. Thornton, P.H. & Ocasio, W. 2008, Institutional logics. The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism.
3. Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. Academy of management journal, 50(2), 289-307.
4. Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. 2010. Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 53(6): 1419-1440.
5. Kellogg, K. C. (2019). Subordinate activation tactics: Semi-professionals and micro-level institutional change in professional organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 64(4), 928-975.

Further Reading

- DiMaggio, P. 1988. Interest and agency in institutional theory. Pp 3-21 in L.G. Zucker (ed) Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger
- Haveman, H. A., & Rao, H. 1997. Structuring a theory of moral sentiments: Institutional and organizational coevolution in the early thrift industry. American journal of sociology, 102(6), 1606-1651.

Session 11 Culture

1. Schein, E. 1990. Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45: 109-119.
2. Swidler, A. 1986. Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51 (2), 273-286.
3. Rivera, L. A. 2012. Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review*, 77(6), 999-1022.
4. Lizardo, O. 2006. How Cultural Tastes Shape Personal Networks. *American Sociological Review*, 71: 778-807.
5. Srivastava, S. B., Goldberg, A., Manian, V. G., & Potts, C. (2018). Enculturation trajectories: Language, cultural adaptation, and individual outcomes in organizations. *Management Science*, 64(3), 1348-1364.

Further Reading

- Giorgi, S., Lockwood, C., & Glynn, M. A. 2015. The many faces of culture: Making sense of 30 years of research on culture in organization studies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 9(1), 1-54.
- DiMaggio, P. 1997. Culture and cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23(1), 263-287.
- Kunda, G. 1992. *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Srivastava, S.B. & Banaji, M.R. 2011. "Culture, Cognition, and Collaborative Networks in Organizations." *American Sociological Review*. 76: 207-233.
- Goldberg, A., Srivastava, S. B., Manian, V. G., Monroe, W., & Potts, C. 2016. Fitting in or standing out? The tradeoffs of structural and cultural embeddedness. *American Sociological Review*, 81(6), 1190-1222.

Session 12 Status and Reputation

1. Podolny, J. M. 1993. A status-based model of market competition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(4), 829-872.
2. Phillips, D. J., & Zuckerman, E. W. 2001. Middle-status conformity: Theoretical restatement and empirical demonstration in two markets. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(2), 379-429.
3. Rindova, V. P., Williamson, I. O., Petkova, A. P., & Sever, J. M. (2005). Being good or being known: An empirical examination of the dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of organizational reputation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6), 1033-1049.
4. Kovács, B., & Sharkey, A. J. 2014. The paradox of publicity: How awards can negatively affect the evaluation of quality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59(1), 1-33.
5. Kim, J. W., & King, B. G. 2014. Seeing stars: Matthew effects and status bias in major league baseball umpiring. *Management Science*, 60(11), 2619-2644.

Further Reading

- Sauder, M., Lynn, F., & Podolny, J. M. 2012. Status: Insights from organizational sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 38, 267-283.
- Gould, R. V. 2002. The origins of status hierarchies: A formal theory and empirical test. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(5), 1143-1178.

- Pfarrer, M. D., Pollock, T. G., & Rindova, V. P. 2010. A tale of two assets: The effects of firm reputation and celebrity on earnings surprises and investors' reactions. Academy of Management Journal, 53(5), 1131-1152.
- Graffin, S. D., Bundy, J., Porac, J. F., Wade, J. B., & Quinn, D. P. 2013. Falls from grace and the hazards of high status: The 2009 British MP expense scandal and its impact on parliamentary elites. Administrative Science Quarterly, 58(3), 313-345.

Session 13 Social Movements

1. McAdam, D., & Scott, W. R. 2005. Organizations and movements. In Davis, G. F., McAdam, D., Scott, W. R., & Zald, M. N. (Eds.). Social Movements and Organization Theory. Cambridge University Press.
2. King, B. G., & Soule, S. A. 2007. Social movements as extra-institutional entrepreneurs: The effect of protests on stock price returns. Administrative Science Quarterly, 52(3), 413-442.
3. Weber, K., Rao, H., & Thomas, L. G. 2009. From streets to suites: How the anti-biotech movement affected German pharmaceutical firms. American Sociological Review, 74(1), 106-127.
4. McDonnell, M. H., & King, B. 2013. Keeping up appearances: Reputational threat and impression management after social movement boycotts. Administrative Science Quarterly, 58(3), 387-419.
5. Walker, E. T. (2009). Privatizing participation: Civic change and the organizational dynamics of grassroots lobbying firms. American Sociological Review, 74(1), 83-105.

Further Reading

- Zald, M.N & Berger, M.A. 1978. Social movements in organizations - Coup detat, insurgency and mass movements. American Journal of Sociology, 83(4): 823-861.
- Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. 2003. Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. American Journal of Sociology, 108(4): 795-843.
- Ingram, P., Yue, L. Q., & Rao, H. 2010. Trouble in store: Probes, protests, and store openings by Wal-Mart, 1998–2007. American Journal of Sociology, 116(1), 53-92.
- Haveman, H. A., Rao, H., & Paruchuri, S. 2007. The winds of change: The progressive movement and the bureaucratization of thrift. American Sociological Review, 72(1), 117-142.
- Sine, W. D., & Lee, B. H. 2009. Tilting at windmills? The environmental movement and the emergence of the US wind energy sector. Administrative Science Quarterly, 54(1), 123-155.
- King, B. G., & Pearce, N. A. 2010. The contentiousness of markets: Politics, social movements, and institutional change in markets. Annual Review of Sociology, 36, 249-267.

Session 14 Professions and Work

1. Abbott, Andrew. 1988. The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 1 & 2.
2. Bechky, B. A. 2003. Object lessons: Workplace artifacts as representations of occupational jurisdiction. American Journal of Sociology, 109(3), 720-752.
3. Kang, S. K., DeCelles, K. A., Tilcsik, A., & Jun, S. (2016). Whitened résumés: Race and self-presentation in the labor market. Administrative Science Quarterly, 61(3), 469-502.

4. Ranganathan, A., & Benson, A. (2020). A numbers game: Quantification of work, auto-gamification, and worker productivity. *American Sociological Review*, 85(4), 573-609.
5. Wilmers, N. (2020). Job turf or variety: Task structure as a source of organizational inequality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(4), 1018-1057.

Further Reading

- Baron, J. N. & W.T. Bielby. 1980. Bringing the firms back in: Stratification, segmentation, and the organization of work. *American Sociological Review*, 45: 737- 765
- Kalleberg, A. L., B. F. Reskin, & K. Hudson. 2000. Bad jobs in America: Standard and non-standard employment relations and job quality in the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 65: 256-278
- Freidson, E. 1970. *Profession of Medicine: A Study of the Sociology of Applied Knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Kanter, R. M. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

SUPPORT SERVICES

If you need accommodation for a **disability**, obtain a Letter of Accommodation from the Office of Disability Services. The Office of Disability Services at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, provides student-centered and student-inclusive programming in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments of 2008, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1998, and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination. More information can be found at ods.rutgers.edu.

[Rutgers University-New Brunswick ODS phone (848)445-6800 or email dsoffice@echo.rutgers.edu]
 [Rutgers University-Newark ODS phone (973)353-5375 or email ods@newark.rutgers.edu]

If you are **pregnant**, the Office of Title IX and ADA Compliance is available to assist with any concerns or potential accommodations related to pregnancy.

[Rutgers University-New Brunswick Title IX Coordinator phone (848)932-8200 or email jackie.moran@rutgers.edu]

[Rutgers University-Newark Office of Title IX and ADA Compliance phone (973)353-1906 or email TitleIX@newark.rutgers.edu]

If you seek **religious accommodations**, the Office of the Dean of Students is available to verify absences for religious observance, as needed.

[Rutgers University-New Brunswick Dean of Students phone (848)932-2300 or email deanofstudents@echo.rutgers.edu]

[Rutgers University-Newark Dean of Students phone (973)353-5063 or email DeanofStudents@newark.rutgers.edu]

If you have experienced any form of **gender or sex-based discrimination or harassment**, including sexual assault, sexual harassment, relationship violence, or stalking, the Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance provides help and support. More information can be found at <http://vpva.rutgers.edu/>.

[Rutgers University-New Brunswick incident report link: <http://studentconduct.rutgers.edu/concern/>. You may contact the Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance at (848)932-1181]

[Rutgers University-Newark incident report link:

https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?RutgersUniv&layout_id=7 . You may also contact the Office of Title IX and ADA Compliance at (973)353-1906 or email at TitleIX@newark.rutgers.edu. If you wish to speak with a staff member who is confidential and does **not** have a reporting responsibility, you may contact the Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance at (973)353-1918 or email run.vpva@rutgers.edu

If students who have experienced a temporary condition or injury that is adversely affecting their ability to fully participate, you should submit a request via <https://temporaryconditions.rutgers.edu> .

If you are a military **veteran** or are on active military duty, you can obtain support through the Office of Veteran and Military Programs and Services. <http://veterans.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of **mental health** services, please use our readily available services.
[Rutgers University-Newark Counseling Center: <http://counseling.newark.rutgers.edu/>]
[Rutgers Counseling and Psychological Services–New Brunswick: <http://rhscaps.rutgers.edu/>]

If you are in need of **physical health** services, please use our readily available services.
[Rutgers Health Services – Newark: <http://health.newark.rutgers.edu/>]
[Rutgers Health Services – New Brunswick: <http://health.rutgers.edu/>]

If you are in need of **legal** services, please use our readily available services: <http://rusls.rutgers.edu/>

Students experiencing difficulty in courses due to **English as a second language (ESL)** should contact the Program in American Language Studies for supports.
[Rutgers–Newark: PALS@newark.rutgers.edu]
[Rutgers–New Brunswick: eslpals@english.rutgers.edu]

If you are in need of additional **academic assistance**, please use our readily available services.
[Rutgers University-Newark Learning Center: <http://www.ncas.rutgers.edu/rlc>]
[Rutgers University-Newark Writing Center: <http://www.ncas.rutgers.edu/writingcenter>]
[Rutgers University-New Brunswick Learning Center: <https://rlc.rutgers.edu/>]
[Optional items that many faculty include:

- Students must sign, date, and return a statement declaring that they understand the RU Academic Integrity Policy.
- Students must sign, date, and return a statement declaring that they understand this syllabus.]